

REMARKS

In response to item 2 of the Office action of April 05, 2007, it is respectfully submitted that the PCT/DO/EO/903 reflects that copies of the references cited in the ISR were received by the Office along with a copy of the ISR indicating relevance. In view of this, the Examiner is requested to consider all of the references cited in the IDS of 5/19/2005. MPEP 609.03 and 609.04(a) iii.

In response to the items 3 and 4 of the Office action of April 05, 2007, claims 5 to 7 have been amended. It is, therefore, believed that currently amended claims 5 to 7 are now in proper form.

Referring to the item 6 of the Office action of April 05, 2007, claim 1 has been amended to define that the setting means is further responsive to the direction of relative rotation between the displaying means and the operating means, for controlling the operation modes in accordance with detected directions of rotation. In other words, the setting means is responsive to the position (e.g. twisted or non-twisted), and the direction of rotation to arrive at the current rotation.

Basis for this feature may, for example, be found on page 9, lines 12-22; page 11, lines 4-9; page 12, lines 30-34; and numerous other references in the description and flow-diagrams, to controlling the operation depending on whether or not the rotation is in a clockwise or counterclockwise direction.

The use of the rotation direction to determine operation modes can provide very versatile equipment, and can provide a way of enhancing the inputting of selections made by a user. Moreover, such use of the rotation direction is not suggested or described in any of the

cited document "Shibata". It will, therefore, be appreciated from the foregoing description that the mobile communication apparatus defined in currently amended claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the disclosure of the cited document "Shibata".

Claim 2 has been clarified to refer the "rotating means". Claim 2 is dependent on claim 1 which is believed to be patentably distinguishable over the disclosure of the cited document "Shibata" as will be understood from the previously mentioned reasons. It is, therefore, believed that claim 2 is patentably distinguishable over the disclosure of the cited document "Shibata" based on the same reasons as above.

Claim 3 is dependent on claim 2 which is believed to be patentably distinguishable over the disclosure of the cited document "Shibata" as will be understood from the previously mentioned reasons. It is, therefore, believed that claim 3 is patentably distinguishable over the disclosure of the cited document "Shibata" based on the same reasons as above.

Claim 4 has been amended to clarify the functional definition. Claim 4 is dependent on claim 2 or claim 3 which is believed to be patentably distinguishable over the disclosure of the cited document "Shibata" as will be understood from the previously mentioned reasons. It is, therefore, believed that claim 4 is patentably distinguishable over the disclosure of the cited document "Shibata" based on the same reasons as above.

Claim 5 is dependent on any one of claims 1 to 3 each of which is believed to be patentably distinguishable over the disclosure of the cited document "Shibata" as will be understood from the previously mentioned reasons. It is, therefore, believed that claim 5 is patentably distinguishable over the disclosure of the cited document "Shibata" based on the same reasons as above.

Claim 6 is dependent on claim 2 which is believed to be patentably distinguishable over

Appl. No. 10/535,566
Amdt. dated June 18, 2007
Reply to Office action of April 5, 2007

the disclosure of the cited document "Shibata" as will be understood from the previously mentioned reasons. It is, therefore, believed that claim 6 is patentably distinguishable over the disclosure of the cited document "Shibata" based on the same reasons as above.

Claim 7 is dependent on claim 2 or claim 6 which is believed to be patentably distinguishable over the disclosure of the cited document "Shibata" as will be understood from the previously mentioned reasons. It is, therefore, believed that claim 7 is patentably distinguishable over the disclosure of the cited document "Shibata" based on the same reasons as above.

In view of the foregoing description, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is thus in condition for allowance and notification of same is requested.

If any fees are required by this communication, please charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, Order No. 38267.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By 

James M. Moore, Reg. No. 32923

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: June 18, 2007